

TO: Members, Clark Fork Basin Water Management Task Force

FROM: Matthew McKinney, Project Coordinator  
Gerald Mueller, Project Coordinator  
Maureen Hartmann, Project Associate

SUBJECT: Summary of September 8, 2003 Meeting and Next Steps

DATE: September 15, 2003

**Participants:**

***Task Force Members***

Verdell Jackson	Legislature
Marc Spratt	Flathead Conservation District
Jay Struckey	Green Mnt.Conserv. District/ Lower Clark Fork
Elna Darrow	Flathead Basin Commission
Fred Lurie	Blackfoot Challenge
Harvey Hackett	Bitterroot Water Forum
Eugene Manley	Granite County
Holly Frantz	PPL Montana
Matt Clifford	Clark Fork Coalition

***Staff***

Mike McLane	DNRC—Water Resources Division
Matt McKinney	PPRI-Public Policy Research Institute
Gerald Mueller	Montana Consensus Council
Denise Deluca	Emergent Solutions (consultant)
Mo Hartmann	Montana Consensus Council

**Meeting Objectives**

1. Review Draft of Chapter 2
2. Discuss Public Outreach Activities
3. Identify and Discuss Plan Issues
4. Update Work Plan



## Review Draft of Chapter 2

Denise Deluca, a hydrologist and consultant for the Task Force, led the participants in a discussion of the first draft of the chapter she prepared on “water availability” in the Clark Fork River basin.

The participants agreed to (1) keep facts and policy issues separate and distinct; (2) provide recommendations of scientific and technical information; and (3) acknowledge the scientific and technical uncertainty associated with water use and management in the basin. The discussion resulted in the following ideas, comments, and recommendations.

### *Data on Irrigated agriculture:*

- NRCS irrigated acreage data. Range of variability of acreage figures; irrigated acres vary with water use. Need a definition of irrigated acres.
- Explain genesis of each data set.
- Choose irrigation acreage database. Qualify and illustrate range of estimates. Which database to use?
- How will we use this data? Is it reliable enough? A). provide a basic set of facts. B.) then set policy issues.
- Average annual discharge in acre-feet and peak and base flows in CFS. Gross totals make it appear that there is more water than there really is. Standardized rating tables and gauges that read directly in CFS help to build trust/credibility of the data from the ground up.

### *Surface Water:*

- Need to update surface water use table. DNRC has staff that can do this. In addition, ground water use table should be added; domestic/multiple domestic commercial/industrial should be broken out. Acknowledge in narrative that timing of use varies tremendously.
- Include both surface and groundwater tables. Include the amount of water claimed by use. (Mike will explore if this is doable.) Calculate percent of water used.
- Numbers need to be explained. They can be misleading and not representative. Point out the uncertainty/weaknesses.
- Break out water use by decade. New table should be broken out by decade.
- Question: is there value in integrating graph on physical availability and water rights use?

*Gaps Section:* The participants agreed that this section still needs work in order for any recommendations to be clearly articulated and understood. The following emerged from our discussion:

- This section needs to be reviewed with DNRC to see what data is still accurate and appropriate.
- Irrigation data also includes non-agricultural uses. Gap—we don’t know how much is ag and how much is non-ag.
- Municipal/Urban growth is occurring in non-metered flat rate systems—use is high.
- Currently, there is no means of accessing cumulative impacts.



- Furthermore, there is no sensitivity analysis—(i.e. how far downstream would diversion be perceptible?)
- Basins do not have quantified in-stream flows. Impact of ESA??---add to projected demands.

*Other topics discussed:*

- Water rights are not adjudicated- this needs to be considered.
- Bitterroot needs a permanent basin closure. Basin is over appropriated.
- Numbers need to be explained. They can be misleading and not representative. Point out the uncertainty/weaknesses.
- Graphics will be taken care of by DNRC.
- Check on the volumes.
- In hydropower section break out by Hungry Horse, Kerr, T. Falls, Noxon.
- Existing urban use should have its own table. Include Table A4A for domestic/municipal use.
- Salmon flows, painted rock, Lake Como
- Stock water drinking from source is an unknown.
- Vegetation management affects total water yield.
- Database needs to be accessible to the public.

For additional comments e-mail Denise at [ddeluca@montanadsl.net](mailto:ddeluca@montanadsl.net).

## **Public Outreach**

The participants discussed publication and distribution of the Task Force's first newsletter. The participants agreed to distribute hard copies to their constituents, and to place an electronic copy of the newsletter on their web sites, if appropriate.

The participants asked Matt and Gerald to distribute copies of the newsletter to everyone on the project's master mailing list.

In addition to discussing the newsletter, Matt and Gerald explained that the Task Force has been invited to participate in a panel discussion on their work at the Leadership Missoula Natural Resource Day. The workshop is scheduled for October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2003, and will be held at Lubrecht Forest, just outside Missoula.

Gerald will serve as the moderator of the panel, and will briefly introduce the idea of collaborative problem solving and consensus building. Verdell Jackson will then speak first from the perspective of a legislator, and why this type of consensus-building forum is valuable to legislators. He will then provide some comments on the project itself from the perspective of agriculture. Matt Clifford agreed to participate on behalf of the conservation/environment perspective, and Holly Frantz will speak from the perspective of hydropower interests. Gerald will contact Phil Torangeau to see if he is willing to participate on behalf of the Native American perspective.



## Plan Issues

Gerald led the group in a discussion on the issues to be discussed in the upcoming months. The preliminary issues that were talked about at the meeting were:

- Ability to get a right to store water in the ground.
- Should use data be collected, stored, and verified?
- Should uses be prioritized?
- Water yield and management of vegetation.
- The definition of water waste.
- Septic vs. central sewage treatment.
- The impact of water management on related resources
- Increased irrigation efficiency produces less ground water recharge.
- Impact of water quality management on water quality.

For more details, please refer to the attached document titled “**Issues for Discussion**”.

## Work Plan

Matt McKinney led the group in a discussion of where it needs to go during the next year. Here is an overview of the schedule for the next 12 months:

Sept’03-Feb ’04 Task Force Work! (6 months)

March ,04	Distribute draft report to the public
April, 04	Convene public meetings to seek input and advice
May-June, 04	Respond to public comment and prepare final recommendations
July-August, 04	Conduct formal process as required by the State Water Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ Conduct formal public hearings</li><li>✓ Consult the Director of the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation</li><li>✓ Consult the legislative Environmental Quality Council</li></ul>
Sept 14, 2004	Respond to formal comments Prepare and distribute final report to the Governor and Legislature

**Homework:** Gerald asked the Task Force members to do a bit of ‘homework’ before the next meeting.

The members agreed to:

- Think about *enforcement* issues; particularly those that relate to the general attribute that enforcement generally falls to individual actions/reporting. What problems do you have with this and how is can best be addressed?
- Think of all the websites where this document could be posted.
- Distribute newsletters to their constituents!



**Next Steps:** The Task Force discussed the immediate next steps that need to be addressed. These steps include:

- A new draft of chapter 2. For a detailed description of what is being done to prepare the fourth draft of chapter 2, please refer to the attached document titled **“Work Planned for Fourth Draft”**. Denise prepared this summary after getting feedback during the September 8<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting.
- More discussion on Hydropower water rights.
- Determine which *issues* we will focus on from today’s discussion.
- More discussion regarding the ‘Conservation Alternatives’ Chapter (municipal water use). Gerald will ask a Montana rural water employee to speak at the next meeting to provide some insight on important issues/ideas to incorporate into the chapter.
- Schedule a chapter to be discussed at each of the next meetings.
- Determine panel participants for leadership day at Lubrecht Forest. Possibly: Matt Clifford, Holly Frantz, Verdell Jackson.

Next Meeting---October 6, 2003